



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/581,959	06/19/2000	Lennart Lindfors	1103326-0623	6637

759G 05/23/2003

White & Case  
Patent Department  
1155 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036-2787

EXAMINER

FAY, ZOHREH A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1614

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Applicati n N .

09/581,959

Applicant(s)

LINDFORS ET AL.

Examiner

Zohreh Fay

Art Unit

1614

-- Th MAILING DATE of this c mmunication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period f r Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ .
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21, 23-34, 40-42, 45 and 46 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21, 23-34, 40-42, 45 and 46 is/are rejected.

- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_ .  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_ .
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_ . 6) ☐ Other: .

Art Unit: 1614

Claims 1-21, 23-34, 40-41 and 45-46 are presented for examination.

The remarks filed on January 22, 2003 have been received and entered.

The final rejection of November 26, 2002 is hereby withdrawn.

Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to practice the instant invention without undue experimentation. Attention is directed to *In Re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex Parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApls 1986) at 547 the court recites eight factors:

- 1) The quantity of experimentation necessary,
- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided,
- 3) the presence or absence of writing examples,
- 4) the nature of the invention,
- 5) the state of the prior art,
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art
- 7) the predictability of the art, and
- 8) the breadth of the claims.

The instant specification fails to set forth any working examples to demonstrate the "prevention" of many different disorders as claimed herein. The pharmaceutical art

Art Unit: 1614

is unpredictable requiring that each embodiment to be assessed for physiological activity. In the instant specification there is support to demonstrate the "prevention" as claimed herein. Applicant fails to provide information sufficient to practice the claimed invention, absent undue experimentation.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1, 2-4, 19, 23, 25, 27, 29-34 and 39-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102 (e) as being anticipated by WO Patent 88/00829. The WO patent teaches the use of biphosphonate in combination with the claimed additive in a pharmaceutical formulation for the treatment of osteoporosis. See the abstract, page4, lines 23-28, page 5, lines 11-14 and lines 22-27. The above reference also teaches the use of such composition in a solid and emulsion form.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 10, 11, 15, 16, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 88/00829.

The WO Patent teaches the use of biphosphonate in combination with the pharmaceutical acceptable additives in a pharmaceutical formulation for the treatment of osteoporosis. See the abstract, page 4, lines 23-28, page 5, lines 11-14 and lines 22-27. The above reference differs from the claimed invention in the use of the specific additives. It would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art to substitute one pharmaceutically acceptable carrier for another. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of the above reference, since it relates to the use of biphosphonate in combination with pharmaceutical acceptable carriers for the treatment of osteoporosis. The substitution of one pharmaceutical acceptable carrier for another would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art in the absence of evidence to the contrary. Applicant has presented no evidence to establish the unexpected or unobvious nature of the claimed invention, and as such, the above claims are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zohreh Fay whose telephone number is (703) 308-4604. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

Art Unit: 1614

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marianne Seidel can be reached on (703) 308-4725. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4556 for regular communications and (703) 308-4556 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Z.F  
May 21, 2003

ZOHREH FAY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1200

